

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the Office action. This response is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any portion of the Office Action not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Office noted that claims 1-20 are pending and rejected. Applicants amend claim 1, 6 and 11. Applicants have not introduced any new matter by way of the foregoing amendments or new claims.

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance.

REJECTION

The Office rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,149,441 issued to Pellegrino et al. (hereon after "*Pellegrino*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,601,432 issued to Bergman et al. (hereon after "*Bergman*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In the Office Action, the Office indicated that "a server is a calculator," and noted that "any computer system performing the claimed 'coupling' would read on the term 'calculator' because all computers are calculators." *Office Action*, page 2.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that a "computer" is a computing device. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a "computer" is not a "calculator". One of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that a "calculator" is used differently from a "computer". Thus, a computer is a calculating device; however, it is not a "calculator".

Thus, Applicants submit that *Pellegrino* does not teach all the elements recited in amended claim 1. The Applicants submit that *Pellegrino* does not deem claim 1 obvious. Hence, Claim 1, in view of *Pellegrino*, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 6 and 11 recite similar features as those recited in claim 1. In light of the foregoing, the Applicants further submit that *Pellegrino* does not teach all the

elements recited in claims 6 and 11. Consequently, the Applicants submit that *Pellegrino* does not anticipate claims 6 and 11. Hence, claims 6 and 11 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-20 depend directly from claims 1, 6 or 11, and necessarily contain each and every element recited in their respective claim. Since the Applicants submit that *Pellegrino* does not anticipate claims 1, 6 and 11, the Applicants further submit that *Pellegrino* also does not anticipate claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-20. Hence, claims 1-20 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. In addition, the Applicants submit that all of the claims presently in the application comply with 35 U.S.C. §101. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Office believes that any unresolved issues still exist or if, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite passing the present application to issue, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney directly at 972-917-4365 or the office of the undersigned attorney at 972-917-5352 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 25, 2010

By: /MIRNA ABYAD/
MIRNA ABYAD
Registration No. 58,615
Texas Instruments
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Telephone: (972) 917-4365